

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/652,159	08/31/2000	Te-Kai Liu	YOR9-2000-0385US1	2619	
30743	7590 11/25/2003		EXAMINER		
WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.			FRENEL, VANEL		
	ET HILLS ROAD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUITE 340			ARTONII	FAFER NUMBER	
RESTON, VA 20190			3626		
				DATE MAILED: 11/25/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action 09/652,159	NCE. a in					
Examiner Vanel Frenel The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 06 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to	NCE. a in					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address THE REPLY FILED 06 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWA Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to	NCE. a in					
THE REPLY FILED 06 November 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWAL Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to	NCE. a in					
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to	a in					
final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Con Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is late event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extensions of the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as so b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may retearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	EP sion fee fee under set forth in					
 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: 						
(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the 						
issues for appeal; and/or	ying the					
(d) Multiply they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed ame canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ndment					
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT pla application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.	ce the					
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were neval raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	wly					
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and a explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.	n					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed: None.						
Claim(s) objected to: <u>None</u> .						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-19</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other: JOSEPH THOMAS SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER SUPERVISORY PATENT ASSOCIATION ASSOCIATI						
S. Patent and Trademark Office TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 04-01)

Continuation of 2

Note: Applicant's proposed amendment to claim 1 of "renters, wherein there exists no data communication link between the fleet of cars and the management system" and to claim 2 of "within" and to claim 11 of "car without communication between the rental car and the reservation server" are a significant change in the scope of claims as originally presented including this newly added claim require further search and consideration.

Continuation of 5:

Applicant's request for consideration does not place the application in condition for allowance because Applicant's argues features that have not been entered as of the present communication, and Applicant's remarks fails to consider the full teachings of the applied references in the manner discussed in the prior Office Action. Others arguments appear to rehash issues addressed in the Final Rejection of the 10/10/03.